



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

(3)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/227,687	01/08/99	TALLY	F CPI98-03P9MA

DAVID E BROOK  
HAMILTON BROOK SMITH & REYNOLDS  
TWO MILITIA DRIVE  
LEXINGTON MA 02421-4799

HM12/1003

EXAMINER

LEFFERS JR, G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

//

DATE MAILED: 10/03/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/227,687**

Applicant(s)  
**Tally, et al.**

Examiner  
**Gerald G. Leffers Jr.**

Group Art Unit  
**1636**



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire one month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-66 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1636

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restriction***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12, 23-27, 50-54 and 56-58, drawn to methods of determining whether a biomolecule produces a phenotypic effect on a cell in an animal, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- II. Claims 13-22, 28-49 and 55 drawn to methods of identifying a compound which is a functional analog of a biomolecule which produces a phenotypic effect on a cell in culture, classified in class 435, subclass 29.
- III. Claims 59-66, drawn to different pathogenic cells, classified in class 435, subclasses 325, 243.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The inventions of Groups I-II are biologically and functionally different and distinct from one another and thus one does not render the other obvious. The method of Groups I comprises steps which are not required for or present in the methods of the Group II: e.g. introduction of a test cell into an animal. The end results of the methods of Groups I and II are different: determination of the phenotypic effect of expression of a biomolecule in a cell in a living animal (Group I) and determination of the phenotypic effects of a biomolecule in cells in culture (Group II). Thus, the operation, function and effects of these different methods are different and distinct

Art Unit: 1636

from each other. Therefore, the inventions of these different, distinct groups are capable of supporting separate patents.

Inventions of Group III and Groups I-II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the pathogenic cells of Group III can be used in the methods of Group I or Group II.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Group III Species I, choose one claim from claims 60-63, each of which is directed to a different pathogenic cell type.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 59 generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable

Art Unit: 1636

thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to David Brook on 8/1/00 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any

Art Unit: 1636

amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### *Conclusion*

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone numbers for the Group are (703) 308-4242 and (703) 305-3014. NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald Leffers, Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 308-6232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from about 9:00 AM to about 5:30 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (usually no later than 24 hours after receipt by the examiner).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. George Elliott, can be reached on (703) 308-4003.

Application/Control Number: 09/227,687

Page 6

Art Unit: 1636

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

*GAJ*

G. Leffers, Jr.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1636

DAVID GUZO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*David Guzo*

September 26, 2000